

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/757,070	SEAMAN ET AL.
	Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell	Art Unit 3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.

(3) _____

(2) Marisa Dubuc.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 January 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: all, especially Examiner's Affidavit.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Katherine Mitchell
Primary Examiner



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called several times requesting an interview when examiner was sick, and examiner called to apologize for the delay and agreeing to the interview after Final. Examiner agreed the IDS was compliant. Examiner stated that she believed an Affidavit can be used to support Official Notice that something is old and well-known when she has direct first hand knowledge of multiple occurrences of its use prior to applicant's invention. Examiner agreed to provide this in a new final rejection rather than an advisory action at applicant's request, to give applicant an opportunity to consider the affidavit without undue time pressure due to examiner's illness.